



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/459,240	12/10/1999	HAMID BACHA	CA9-98-040	9886

7590

09/04/2003

JAMES E MURRAY
69 SOUTH GATE DRIVE
POUGHKEEPSIE, NY 12601

EXAMINER

KIM, JUNG W

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2132

DATE MAILED: 09/04/2003

3

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/459,240

Applicant(s)

BACHA ET AL.

Examiner

Jung W Kim

Art Unit

2132

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-12 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-12 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 10 December 1999 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on ____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) ____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). ____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other:

DETAILED ACTION

Drawings

1. The drawings are objected to because on Figure 3, the flowchart is not labeled with yes/no actions. A proposed drawing correction or corrected drawings are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Specification

2. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities: on page 5, line 30, the phrase "not encrypted to that the business partner" should read "not encrypted so that the business partner"; on page 6, line 18, the phrase "Thus, in convention systems where documents" should be "Thus, in conventional systems where documents"; on page 12, line 8, the specification refers to a Figure 4: there is no Figure 4 drawing in the application; on page 20, line 25, the sentence is not grammatical. Appropriate correction is required.

3. The disclosure is objected to because the specification omits essential subject matter. Applicant discloses the following:

"In such conventional systems, the document deposited by the document originator 100 is normally not encrypted [so] that the business partner 106 will be able to review the document on demand. This is because there are problems associated with decrypting documents in the prior art. Document

decryption requires access to the private key of the document originator 100." (page 5, line 29 - page 6, line 2)

However, the applicant does not disclose the type of encryption algorithm used in this example. The applicant's disclosure is not true in the case where the document is encrypted with the private key. In that scenario, the public key would decrypt the document. Clarification is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Frisch Essential System Administration 2nd Edition (hereinafter Frisch). As per claim 1, Frisch teaches a UNIX file access system with the following components:

(a) a manifest for an electronic data file listing access controls for the electronic data file (see Frisch, pages 234-236, 'Access Control Lists');

(b) a first record of a first user computer's access privileges to the electronic data file (see Frisch, page 145-146; page 191, '/etc/passwd & /etc/group files');

(c) means to communicate changes to the manifest affecting the first user computer's access privileges to the electronic data file for updating the first record (see Frisch, pages 27-32, 'File Protection'; page 237, 1st-3rd paragraph).

(d) means to verify the first user computer's access privileges to the electronic data file before the electronic data file is released to the first user (see Frisch, page 236, 4th paragraph).

In addition, Frisch teaches the Network File System (NFS) for distributed computing, which enables users situated at one computer to access a file system stored on a separate computer (see Frisch, page 607, 'NFS and NIS'). In an example disclosed by Frisch, users are dispersed on several physical computers as well as their home accounts, with shared files residing on a separate computer (see Frisch, page 612, 'Exporting Local Filesystems'; page 615, 3rd-6th paragraph). Inherent in this configuration is an agent program for each UNIX computer that is networked by NFS. Furthermore, since the /etc/group and /etc/passwd files are on each UNIX computer (see Frisch, page 144, 2nd paragraph), each user computer has an agent program with access and maintenance rights to their respective record for user computer's access privileges. Finally, only a single manifest is supplied for each electronic data file as taught by Frisch. The owner of a given file having a manifest has access and maintenance rights to the manifest. In this sense, the owner of the file and the account of the owner are operatively equivalent to the first agent program disclosed by the applicant in claim 1. Hence, the following are also covered:

(i) a first agent program for a depositor computer of an electronic data file in the data repository system and

(ii) a second agent program for a first user computer with access privileges to the electronic data file.

The aforementioned covers all of claim 1.

5. As per claim 2, Frisch covers a UNIX file access system as outlined above in the claim 1 rejection under 35 U.S.C. 102(b). In addition, Frisch teaches several secure measures to maintain the integrity of the functions and resources of a UNIX system (see Frisch, page 246, 'Crack'; page 628, 'Satan'). Hence, the first agent program is a secure extension of the depositor computer and the second agent program is a secure extension of the first user computer.

6. As per claim 3, Frisch covers a UNIX file access system as outlined above in the claim 2 rejection under 35 U.S.C. 102(b). In addition, changes to the manifest affecting the first user computer's access privileges to the electronic data file are communicated from the second agent program to the first user computer (see Frisch, pages 27-32, 'File Protection'; page 237, 1st-3rd paragraph).

7. As per claim 4, Frisch covers a UNIX file access system as outlined above in the claim 2 rejection under 35 U.S.C. 102(b). The reasons disclosed in the claim 2 rejection covers a multiplicity of users having corresponding agent programs, whereupon each of these other agent programs for their respective user computer is responsive in the same manner as the second agent is with the first user and with the first agent program. Hence, claim 4 is covered by the teachings of Frisch.

8. As per claim 5, Frisch covers a UNIX file access system as outlined above in the claim 4 rejection under 35 U.S.C. 102(b). In addition, for the reasons disclosed above in the claim 2 rejection, the third agent program is a secure extension of the second user computer.

9. As per claim 6, Frisch covers a UNIX file access system as outlined above in the claim 5 rejection under 35 U.S.C. 102(b). In addition, changes to the manifest affecting the second user computer's access privileges to the electronic data file are communicated from the third agent program to the second user computer (see Frisch, pages 27-32, 'File Protection'; page 237, 1st-3rd paragraph).

10. As per claim 7, Frisch covers a UNIX file access system as outlined above in the claim 5 rejection under 35 U.S.C. 102(b). Inherent in the NFS taught by Frisch is a file server.

11. As per claim 8, Frisch covers a UNIX file access system as outlined above in the claim 5 rejection under 35 U.S.C. 102(b). Inherent in the NFS with multiple physical computers is a switching hub to receive all communications to and from the data repository system and the agent programs. The switching hub is operatively an interface between the two computers.

12. As per claim 9, Frisch covers a UNIX file access system as outlined above in the claim 8 rejection under 35 U.S.C. 102(b). In addition, Frisch teaches ways to control environmental factors to maintain physical system security (see page 207, 3rd bullet). Hence, the interface is a secure extension of the data repository system.

13. As per claims 10-12, they are method and apparatus claims corresponding to claims 1-9 and they do not teach or define above the information claimed in claims 1-9. Therefore, claims 10-12 are rejected as being anticipated by Frisch for the same reasons set forth in the rejections of claims 1-9.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Wang U.S. Patent No. 5,414,844 discloses a method and system for controlling public access to a plurality of data objects within a data processing system.

Schneck et al. U.S. Patent No. 6,314,409 discloses a system for controlling access and distribution of digital property.

Broomhall et al. U.S. Patent No. 6,292,904 discloses a system for the generation and authentication of a client.

Tada et al. U.S. Patent No. 6,178,422 discloses a method for information registration and document information processing.

Rosenow et al. U.S. Patent No. 5,483,596 discloses an apparatus and method for controlling access to computer system resources.

Hart U.S. Patent No. 5,787,428 discloses a method to control database access.

Ginter et al. U.S. Patent No. 6,253,193 discloses systems and methods for the secure transaction management and electronic rights protection.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jung W Kim whose telephone number is (703) 305-8289. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 9:00 A.M. to 5:00 P.M..

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Gilberto Barron can be reached on (703) 305-1830. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.



Jung W Kim
Examiner
Art Unit 2132

Jk
August 26, 2003

GILBERTO BARRON
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100